DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 187 UD 030 067

AUTHOR Smith, Jewell R.
TITLE Implementing Problem-Solving Techniques in an Urban Central Office Department by Establishing Teams and Infusing TQM Concepts.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 104p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Change Agents; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Group Dynamics; *Management Teams; Participative Decision Making; Problem Solving; *School Administration; *Teamwork; *Total Quality Management; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This practicum is designed to assist central office personnel in evaluating the work environment for better coordination to accomplish work, plan for a change effort, and implement a participatory change initiative. The work setting involved a K-12 urban school district (193 schools) containing 431 central-office administrators and more than 10,000 noninstructional personnel, of which 14 department administrators and 15 support-staff members participated in activities to assess: (1) willingness to increase the emphasis on teamwork, (2) readiness in preparing for change, (3) identification of areas in need of change, and (4) leader behaviors with respect to a team effort. Total Quality Management-based activities involved unit members in group processes, group dynamics, and team-building and problem-solving techniques. Through group discussion, the unit members synthesized information relative to the effectiveness of teamwork in the accomplishment of unit, department, and district goals. Results reveal that unit members are more productive and effective when they function as a team. They were also more apt to look for areas in need of change and to initiate a change effort. Appendices provide the study's questionnaires. (Contains 23 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 187

Implementing Problem-Solving Techniques in an Urban Central Office Department by Establishing Teams and Infusing TQM Concepts

by

Jewell R. Smith

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Cluster XLV

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. R. Smith
Nova Univ.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

A Practicum II Report presented to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

1994

UD030067

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTICUM APPROVAL

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: Ruben Parker

Ruben Parker

Training Specialist, Skills Development Unit, Human Resource Development Department
Title

School Board of Broward County, Florida
600 S.W. 6th Street
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
Address

June 20, 1994
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Jewell R. Smith under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova Southeastern University.

Approved:

July 25, 1994
Date of Final Approval of Report

Georgianna Lowen
Georgianna Lowen, Ed.D., NSU
Adviser

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This practicum is dedicated to my mother, Grace M. Richardson, who was the "Wind Beneath My Wings." Although not with me physically, her presence is ever felt. To her I owe the fortitude she instilled in me as a child and the never ending support and love she gave me throughout her life.

I offer much gratitude to Dianne Aucamp and Ruben Parker, who not only allowed me to implement this practicum in the department and unit, respectively, served as mentors and supporters throughout the implementation period. To Donna Canna, my secretary in the Leadership Development Unit and Sharon, Kay, Julie, and Tony in the Skills Development Unit, thanks for giving of yourselves in the change effort. Without your commitment and willingness to work at a process change, the success of this practicum would not have been realized. You are indeed torchbearers of change, problem solving, and TQM--a team indeed.

A special thanks to Dorothy Gannon, my typist, whose hard work helped to get me to this point. Heartfelt thanks to Dr. Georgianna Lowen, my practicum advisor, who was a constant source of encouragement and inspiration from beginning to end of the practicum.

To my family, friends, and coworkers, thanks for putting up with me and being there through thick and thin. I appreciate the moments we shared, the laughter and the tears. You are so special, and to you I also dedicate this practicum.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		iv
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Description of Work Setting and Community	1
	Writer's Work Setting and Role	2
II	STUDY OF THE PROBLEM	7
	Problem Description.	7
	Problem Documentation.	10
	Causative Analysis	12
	Relationship of the Problem to the Literature.	15
III	ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS.	21
	Goals and Expectations	21
	Expected Outcomes.	21
	Measurement of Outcomes.	22
IV	SOLUTION STRATEGY.	25
	Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions	25
	Description of Selected Solution	40
	Report of Action Taken	44
V	RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	52
	Results	52
	Discussion	67
	Recommendations	72
	Dissemination	74
REFERENCES.		75

Page

Appendices

A INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE 78

B READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE 84

C TEAM LEADERSHIP CONTINUUM 91

D PROBLEM-SOLVING TECHNIQUES QUESTIONNAIRE . . . 95

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table

1 Breakdown of the Mind Styles in the Unit 58

2 Problem-Solving Techniques Implemented and Used in Unit 63

ABSTRACT

Implementing Problem-Solving Techniques in an Urban Central Office Department by Establishing Teams and Infusing TQM Concepts. Smith, Jewell R., 1994: Practicum Report, Nova Southeastern University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Participatory Management/Change/Teams/TQM/Problem-Solving Techniques

This practicum was designed to assist central office personnel in evaluating the work environment in terms of the need for coordination to accomplish work, planning for a change effort, and implementing a participatory change initiative. Department members engaged in activities to assess (a) willingness to increase the emphasis on teamwork, (b) readiness in preparing for change, (c) identifying areas in need of change, and (d) leader behaviors with respect to a team effort.

The writer conducted TQM-based activities that involved unit members in group process, group dynamics, team-building and problem-solving techniques. Through group discussion, the unit members synthesized information relative to the effectiveness of teaming to accomplish unit, department, and district goals.

Analysis of the results revealed that unit members are more productive and effective when they function as a team. They are also more apt to look for areas in need of change and initiate a change effort.

* * * *

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (✓) do not ( ) give permission to Nova Southeastern University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova Southeastern University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of the materials.

June 19, 1994
Date

Jewell R. Smith
Signature

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

The writer's work setting was a large urban school district consisting of 193 K-12 schools, over 189,500 students, and over 18,000 employees. The district employed 7,300 teachers, 519 school-based administrators (principals and assistant principals), 431 central office administrators, and over 10,000 noninstructional personnel. The figures do not include the thousand or so temporary and part-time employees.

The student population of over 189,500 represented the K-12 population. The district served a similar number in its adult and community education schools. The student population trends of the county resulted not only in changing demographics in the various surrounding school communities but an increase in student population of over 10,000 students a year districtwide. The school district demographer projected a student population of over 200,000 within the next 5 years. However, the destruction that Hurricane Andrew of 1992 caused has resulted in the migration of families from areas devastated by that storm to neighboring counties and subsequently altering the population projections. Additionally, the migration of

families from island countries in the Atlantic and Caribbean, and South and Central America have also impacted community and student growth.

The State Plant Survey completed in May 1993, which was based on population projections, indicated the district needed 49 new schools within the next 5 years. However, funds were appropriated for 19 schools. The difference in projected needs versus appropriation caused a severe strain on the district not only in terms of housing and servicing the students but in the number of administrators needed to manage and lead schools. Administrative needs for the district are as complex and complicated as the facilities and student needs. Based on the 5-year projected student growth, administrative attrition, and new school fund appropriations, 66 principals and 96 assistant principals will be needed.

Coupled with facilities and administrative needs the increased student population brought with it its special needs as well. The already transient district population brought a myriad of social and economic challenges to the district which resulted in the development and coordination of programs to address those needs, as well as the needs of central office and building-based managers and leaders.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The school district consisted of a seven-member board of education; superintendent; deputy superintendent; three geographical area superintendents representing schools in the north, central, and south areas of the county; and five central office associate superintendents representing the divisions of Budget and Finance, Facilities and Property Maintenance, Human Resource Development and Professional Standards, Instruction and Personnel, Policies, Community and Government Relations.

More specific to the writer's work setting, the writer worked in the Human Resource Development and Professional Standards Division. The division, led by an associate superintendent, was divided into two departments: Human Resource Development (HRD) and Professional Standards. HRD consisted of a department director, four functional unit directors (instructional, leadership, organizational, and skills development units), five training specialists, four staff assistants, an administrative assistant, and 15 clerical support staff members. The Professional Standards Department consisted of a director, coordinator, three trainers (teachers on task assignment), and three clerical support staff. Members of the Professional Standards Department were not involved in this practicum.

The mission of HRD was to increase the educational effectiveness in the school community by providing

leadership that will support district goals through training and development. The four functional units served specific target audiences. For example, the Instructional Development coordinated and provided training programs for the district's contracted teachers, substitute teachers, and work-site inservice facilitator; Organizational Development's training efforts were geared to school organizations, and more recently, central office departments and schools who have adopted the shared decision-making (SDM), Teachers Exploring and Mastering Strategies (TEAMS), and Strategic Analysis of Groups in Education (SAGE) concepts; Skills Development focused on noninstructional and paraprofessional personnel; and Leadership Development serviced potential administrators, assistant principal and principal interns and interims, and practicing administrators. To this end, the department was the main conduit for all training in the district and was the district resource in this regard.

The Leadership Development Unit, of which the writer was the training specialist and coordinator of the potential administrators, called Targeting Organizational Potential System or TOPS, coordinated training for 438 identified potential administrators, 30 assistant principals and principal interns and interims (current projections suggested that 70 assistant principals and principal interns were to be appointed for the 1993-1994 school year), and 519

practicing administrators. This unit consisted of a director who coordinated the training activities for the interns, interims, and practicing administrators; the training specialist who coordinated activities for potential administrators and assisted the director with the myriad projects on the administrators' training calendar; and the staff assistant who served as the logistician for both the director and training specialist and four clerical support members. The two secretaries provided specific services to each administrator and the data entry clerk serviced both the administrators and the bookkeeper (who provided bookkeeping services to the Skills Development Unit). The basic role of the unit was to coordinate and provide managerial and leadership training for potential and practicing administrators in the district.

The writer was a former middle school teacher now serving as a central office administrator who primarily coordinated the TOPS program. Academically, the writer holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree majoring in biology and minoring in chemistry and a Master of Arts Degree in Education specializing in the teaching of science in secondary schools.

In the writer's current job assignment, responsibilities included: coordination of the district's potential administrators program; recruitment of individuals to participate; development and design of activities that

will assist in the participants' personal and professional growth as future visionary school leaders; redesign of the existing program that aligns it with the state mandated principal intern training program, the district's administrative assistant principal intern and interim programs, and current educational leadership trends with respect to the changing role of the site-based administrator; and facilitating schools through the school improvement process.

The writer was the recipient of the 1989-1990 United States Department of Education Christa McAuliffe Award, Learning Magazine's 1991 "Professional Best" National Teacher of Excellence Award, and a 1992 recipient of the Who's Who Among America's Teachers Award. Additionally, the writer's Practicum I is featured in Bridges: Becoming Peaceful by Lowen (1993), second in a series of monographs.

The writer had 18 years work experience in a Fortune 500 company (the Prudential), 5 years teaching experience, and 2 1/2 years experience as a central-office school district administrator.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

Over the past 2 1/2 years, the writer witnessed the emergence of multiple challenges facing the Human Resource Development Department. They included stresses that impact the way HRD addressed the district's major goal--educating children. The major goal was impacted by what the writer has termed, "external and internal stresses or pressures."

In categorizing the stresses, the writer suggested that the external ones are represented by population growth which brought with it a myriad of social issues within the schools that needed to be addressed; economic concerns fostered by the philosophy "let's make better with less"--the need versus appropriated funds for new school is a typical example; and the numerous legislative acts, namely accountability coupled with the existing consent decrees, such as the 1987 desegregation and more recently the META Agreement.

Internal stresses or pressures suggested the development and design programs that will address the multiple needs of the culturally diverse student population to ensure that all students will learn; provide well-trained efficient and effective building-based administrators,

teachers, noninstructional and paraprofessionals personnel and functional organizational personnel; and operate and manage the department in such a way to ensure that schools and impacted personnel get what they need to meet their goals.

In light of the latter, a review of the existing management operating practices was deemed needed to examine issues related to accountability, school improvement, and the move toward participatory management. More specifically, an assessment of where they are, where they want to and should be, and what can be done to assist the department units in a change effort that would provide collaborative support to the target areas they served.

Traditionally, organizations employ management by objective (MBO) strategies, or crisis management modalities. In management by objective strategies, the department head sets the objectives for the department or objectives are handed down by a higher authority. A meeting of the administrators is called and each administrator selects objective(s) to accomplish during the year. Periodic reports and meetings are arranged to determine the status of the objective(s). At the end of the year, the administrator's annual performance review is, more often than not, guided by the accomplishment of the department objective(s).

As MBO strategies became the norm in organizations, a shift toward more employee (administrator) input became significant. Administrators were then charged with developing objectives for their units or programs, including a personal, professional development objective along with action steps to accomplish those objectives. Again, the results-reporting mechanisms were the same and, as with tradition, the performance assessment was based on meeting the objectives in addition to carrying out regularly assigned job roles, responsibilities, and tasks.

Coupled with some objective management strategy, crisis management modalities were inherent in the operation. The crisis could be generated from a variety of sources. The more common two sources are: (a) within the administrators' program area, or (b) an external source who presented the crisis to the department or the specific program area that it affected. In either case, the administrator rearranged his/her schedule, resolved the immediate crisis, and then resumed regular duties.

Whether MBO or crisis management strategies were employed, support staff employees were not involved, either in developing the program area objectives or providing input to resolve the crisis. When a mandate is issued, usually it is followed by a strategy, a fix-it, a report, and a recommendation directive. To resolve the issue, objective, or crisis, the administrator would work alone, develop a

plan, tell the support staff what to do, and expect the mandated results.

The ramifications of these traditional management strategies present far-reaching implications in the workplace today. Current trends suggest input from all is better. Administrators are busy administrating and their support staff supporting (that is, busy trying to do what they are told to do). The point is, the act of telling employees what to do and how to do it has created a generation of employees who want to continue being told what and how to do, yet they quietly stage complaints with one another in the background. This continual top-down managerial/administrative style has championed the "we" versus "them or they" separation of administrators and support staff, promoted decaying employee relationship effectiveness and productivity, and has led to the harboring of feelings that their input is not wanted or needed.

The problem is that the current expectations of the district present new and different challenges that require managerial and leadership operational modalities and strategies most administrators are ill-equipped to handle.

Problem Documentation

In the capacity of a district level administrator in a central office department of a large urban school district, the writer has had multiple opportunities to discuss and witness managerial operations at both the district and

school level. More specifically, over the past year and a half, as an Assisting Change in Education (ACE) Coach, while facilitating three school staffs through their school improvement initiatives, the writer observed, as well as questioned faculty members, parents, community representatives and administrators on the respective school improvement teams regarding managerial operating procedures in the school. (The role of the administrator is changing because the accountability legislation and the State Blueprint 2000 goals now require they get input from all stakeholder groups.) The writer concluded that administrators are not ready to assume the requirement of the new role.

One of the major responsibilities as an ACE coach was to facilitate, coach, support, and foster collaboration, empowerment, and shared decision-making among the various stakeholder members on the School Improvement Team. This was a difficult role for the writer, because not only did building-based administrators want to direct the school improvement team; the team, so accustomed to the principal as the powerhead, expected and wanted him/her to assume that role. Additionally, through interviewing 10 principals, 3 district-level administrators, and 6 clerical support staff, it was also revealed that administrators are uncertain of the techniques and strategies to use to involve staff members in functional decision-making and problem-solving

processes. Staff members tend to do as they are told, most employees hope that what is happening in education today is a passing fancy, administrators manage as each crisis surfaces, and administrators tend to use managerial techniques to direct employees rather than use systematic approaches to lead employees.

Causative Analysis

It is the writer's belief that causes of the problem are concentrated within the individuals directly involved--administrators and supporting staff members. Traditionally, most district-level administrators are appointed to their positions after having served several years as a classroom teacher and/or a quasi school-based administrator, such as a guidance director, resource teacher, or some type of education specialist (for example, the curriculum specialist or the exceptional student education specialist at a school site). Their outside training, whether inservice offered by the school district or collegiate coursework in an institution of higher learning, has been limited to specific job functions. Within the school district, managerial or leadership training has not been provided for individuals in quasi administrative positions. For the most part, it is neither supported or encouraged by many building-based administrators or other individuals in leadership positions for various reasons, but mostly, because it required time off the job.

On the other hand, assistant principals and principals in the district have been provided managerial training rather than leadership training. Over the past few years some effort has been given to infusing leadership training in the respective school-based administrative intern training programs. Nevertheless, district-level positions are filled by former assistant principals and principals who have had some training and others by quasi school-based administrators who have not. To this end, a void in the administrator's functional role has been created.

Institutions of higher learning provide generic, theoretical concepts related to leadership skills but little or no appropriation for specific practical applications in the work setting. In addition, the writer has found that limited communication exists between the district and schools of education with respect to administrative leadership training needs and how these needs may be addressed in the respective preparatory leadership curriculum. Therefore, the burden of developing administrative leadership training programs, appropriation of time for practical application, monitoring evaluation and feedback for individuals aspiring to or assuming administrative positions rests with the school district training department. Constraints related to budget, time, and human resources hamper the inclusion of what is developmentally appropriate for education leaders.

Over the past 2 years, the writer has observed that limited collegiate and in-house leadership preparation, as well as the organizational structure, give rise to and support the noncollaborative work environment. Administrators and staff alike tend to work in isolation or in "silos." Additionally, because administrators have had little exposure to leadership management strategies that lead to including employees in the decision-making and problem-solving processes of the organization, they perceive that their staff is happy. Administrators continue to tell staff members what to do, take care of problems as they arise, and work in isolation.

On the other hand, interviews with the support staff indicate concern about being told how to do their job without the benefit of being asked their opinion. They feel their input not only is insignificant but most times not asked for. They are also concerned about being told what to do without an explanation or reason as to why.

Other causes of the problem are linked to position, power, and communication and interpersonal-relationship skills. Current day education leadership jargon include "component elements of empowerment," "collaboration," and "shared decision-making" which administrators perceive as a threat to their position power. The traditional organization management and function style, hierarchial and top-down, is giving way to the participatory management and

function style, bottom-up and all inclusive. This paradigm shift from one-on-one to group functioning impacts communication and interpersonal relationship skills for which unit administrators express an interest in further development.

Finally, since functional areas rely on each other as a group and individually to complete specific tasks, more cross-functional communication is needed. Functional area administrators express concern as well as interest in strategies and techniques to enhance cross-functional cohesiveness and connectedness.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

The most profound irony about the education crisis is that most people believe it is someone else's problem (Doyle, 1992). No one wants to take the blame. The first step in obliterating the problem is to recognize and admit that it exists. To this end, Doyle suggests three tasks for the education change agent: (a) raise alarm, (b) propose remedies and solutions, and
(c) implement ideas as solutions.

In the process of raising alarm, one realizes that what exists is not working and what needs to be done requires change. Therein lies a major barrier. Transitions are demanding, difficult, and painful. Educators and the public alike have not only avoided but resisted the painful task of change. The latter two tasks suggested by Doyle are

completely blocked, unless, according to Fullan and Miles (1992), education leaders and other participants "internalize and habitually act on basic knowledge of how successful change takes place" (p. 745), particularly in organizational structure and culture.

Current-day political pressure of choice and accountability legislation as well as societal pressure along with the public outcry for change is forcing school districts to take a hard-and-fast look at their organizations. The general public believes that educators are not producing the products and services it should be. For example, Bowman (1989) states that over three-fourths of the labor force admits to not working to their full potential. The priority to search for techniques to enhance employee efficiency and effectiveness is grounded in the organizational systems which can only be addressed by management's realization and support for change. Yet, how can organizational change be supported if central offices and schools are not on the same wavelength?

Rhodes (1992) contends traditional central office functions have been to collect and take information away from schools and place blame on the school when their (central office) expected outcomes are not realized. The school organization maintains that the present role and relationship with the central office is how things are supposed to be. Rhodes (1992) suggests that this view

shares "characteristics of a dysfunctional family" (p. 76). If a problem exists, they or someone else is responsible to fix it, not the family.

The constructs for a dysfunctional family are prevalent in the traditional school organization systems which provide that directives flow from the superintendent to the principal, principal to the teachers, and teachers to the pupils (Jones & Villines, 1987). This systematic flow also applies at the central office level as well--superintendent to functional area directors, functional area directors to unit coordinators, and unit coordinators to support personnel.

Like the dysfunctional family, organizational systems limit natural intrinsic, human behaviors. They serve as enablers to their most valuable resource, the people. The traditional, top-down, hierarchial organizational system is not only familiar but endorsed. According to Jones and Villines (1987), this organizational structure does not lend itself to worker involvement, the key to increased productivity and employee relations.

All too often, within the rigid hierarchical structure many problems surface. Hunnicutt (1987) maintains that the strict organizational compartmentalization gives rise to problems that include (a) poor communication; (b) feelings of superiority or inferiority, depending on one's position in the organization; and (c) departmental loyalty rather

than organizational loyalty. Hunnicutt further contends that the traditional organizational system matches structure with tasks rather than people, and the design gives rise to a work "environment that supports values of passivity, subservience, and dependency" (p. 319).

Rhodes (1992) also shares the view of decision-separateness in traditional organizations by admitting that administrators, teachers, and other school officials tend to act in isolation although their separate acts are driven by their personal perspectives on what is best for children. Rhodes asserts that while the common focus has been powerful it has now become "a fundamental weakness because decisions are made in isolation, with no way to take advantage of relationships to others who share the same goal" (p. 77). The difficulty in traditional organizational structure is attributed to communication (Ziegenfuss, 1988), and organizational culture and climate (Bonser, 1992).

It is apparent that the rigid organizational structures that make up the school district must be abandoned. Even though the paradigms to be broken are so ingrained in the culture of the organization, Hunnicutt (1987) suggests that there still exists a "utopian-like notion" (p. 138) that prosperity and harmony can be achieved in the workplace. Given this, Shonk (1992) suggests that "it frequently is best to start slow and deliberately plan the magnitude of the change and the time required" (p. 26). Research by

Rhodes (1992), Doyle (1992), and Shonk (1992) also support the idea that change is slow. Adaptations of systematic management strategies impacting structural and cultural changes started in industry over 20-30 years ago, are now realizing the effect of their change effort. Public education has ignored these adaptations (Schargel, 1991). However, Rhodes (1990a), Rhodes (1992), Doyle (1992), and Shonk (1992) believe that schools and school districts have the upper hand over industry in implementing systematic management adaptations because of their fundamental background knowledge in psychology and human development.

The fact is schools and districts are overloaded with problems and heretofore solutions that have not worked. Fullan and Miles (1992) contend that the real problem is the "enormous overload of fragmented, uncoordinated and ephemeral attempts at change" (p. 745). The literature supports Fullan and Miles in the identification of the problem and add that change efforts will continue to fail because of the lack of: (a) knowledge of how successful change takes place; (b) full membership involvement and training (Honeycutt, 1989); (c) recognition of the existence and connectedness of two functional parallel systems, central office, and the school-house (Rhodes, 1992); and (d) management support and involvement (Bonser, 1992; Bowman, 1989; Doyle, 1992; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Honeycutt,

1989; Hunnicutt, 1987; Rhodes, 1990a, 1990b, 1992; Schargel, 1991; and Shonk, 1992).

In essence, the literature supports the fact that the current school district organizational structure and culture limits the productivity and effectiveness of its natural resources, the people. The existent educational dilemma of what is versus what should be coupled with the public outcry for change will remain until the school system structure and culture are overhauled, piece by piece.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

The purpose of this practicum was to assist a group of central office department administrators and support staff personnel in the process of developing problem-solving strategies that would foster employee relations, productivity, and effectiveness. The goal was that each functional unit in the department would become a functional and cross-functional team that would utilize a variety of problem-solving techniques in its everyday operations.

Participating in the activity were 14 department administrators and 15 support staff members. It was anticipated that previous administrative experience and/or training among the department administrators would have some impact on the outcome of this activity.

Expected Outcomes

The writer anticipated several outcomes from the study since most department administrators currently operate in their unit as a functional unit with minimal cross-functional unit involvement. It was anticipated that: (a) 24 out of 29 of the staff members in the department would become major contributors in the operations of the

entire department (see Appendix A); (b) each department member would better understand both individual and group roles, responsibilities, and relationships within and outside the organization (see Appendix B); (c) each functional unit would not only be able to work as a cohesive team but as a cross-functional team to reframe problems into more understandable, smaller ones for easier resolution (see Appendix B); (d) each functional unit would be better able to service central office and school-based personnel for the common good of the major purpose of the organization--educating children (see Appendix C); and (e) each functional unit would be able to identify and utilize problem-solving techniques to resolve various situations (see Appendix D).

The writer anticipated that the end result would be that each functional unit would be a functional and cross-functional team employing problem-solving techniques in its everyday operations.

Measurement of Outcomes

The increased use of problem-solving techniques, measured by the Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire (see Appendix D) administered at midpoint and at the end of implementation, in collaborative efforts between functional and cross-functional units would serve as one tool of evaluation; and a comparison of the Interdependence Questionnaire (see Appendix A), Readiness Planning Questionnaire (see Appendix B), and the Team Leadership

Continuum (see Appendix C) developed by Shonk (1992) in Team-Based Organizations, administered before and after implementation, would serve as the other. Each instrument addresses a specific focus to promote change within an organization. The Interdependence Questionnaire is designed to determine how much interdepartmental coordination is required to accomplish related job functions. The Readiness Planning Questionnaire has a four-pronged focus: (a) to assist the department administrators in identifying areas to focus on when preparing change, (b) to encourage discussion among the functional areas on how to proceed, (c) to identify areas requiring change, and (d) to help to determine the scope of the change effort. The last instrument, the Team Leadership Continuum, focuses on the unit leader and his/her leadership behaviors.

The project would be considered successful when the three questionnaires administered after the implementation showed that each department administrator (a) collaborated with each other to perform department tasks, (b) identified change areas and set about to implement the required changes, and (c) changed his/her leadership behaviors to facilitative and team-oriented, rather than authoritative and one-on-one. In addition, success would be realized when each functional and cross-functional unit identified and resolved problems using either linear or creative problem-solving strategies and each department member recognized the

value of and relied on each other in the decision-making and problem-solving processes.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

The problem was that new school district expectations present new and different challenges that require operational modalities and strategies most administrators are ill-equipped to handle. The literature suggested several solutions to improving operational modalities and strategies for central office administrators so that they may meet school district expectations. These solutions included an array of participatory management concepts: Deming's total quality management (TQM) concepts, reframing organizations, quality circles, and organizational teams.

Rhodes (1990a) contends that there are three reasons why the Deming total quality concept for educational restructuring is not only understandable but adaptable. First, Deming's approach is no secret to educators. It is grounded in psychology and human development with which educators are all too familiar. His system of profound knowledge is the foundation of the quality concept: (a) people are purposeful, cognitive beings with an intrinsic desire to learn and be innovative; (b) organizations should be viewed as whole systems whose aim is to fulfill the mission; (c) knowledge is gained

through experiences which are framed within theories and beliefs and that everybody needs the same theoretical roadmap; and (d) most variations from expected outcomes reflect on the system or process, not the worker (Melvin, 1991, Summer).

Second, current management literature speaks profusely of his influence on the Japanese industry. The influences of improvement, productivity, and large-scale change within organizations have been acknowledged results recognized by the American public and policy makers.

Third, the reframing of what is forces rethinking of organizational connectedness and interrelatedness of components of the process. Reframing also fosters the generation of new solutions to existing problems.

While Deming's ideas, according to Rhodes (1992), are the good news, there are three obstacles which must be overcome: (a) since Deming's work has been with industry, educators fear his concepts will turn schools into factories; (b) currently, administrators (school-based and district-level), teachers, and students are viewed as independent workers and the connectedness of their work is not seen; and (c) educators want assurances that what they do will work, negating the commitment in a change effort.

Bonser (1992) suggests that organizations must make a long-term commitment to both quality and productivity at each stage of the production process. Additionally,

organizations need to understand that the customer is the most important part of any process and that each person involved along a process continuum is both client and producer. The Deming approach to restructuring is systemic. This systemic reframing forces rethinking not only of the total work process but, more importantly, the connections among each component part of the process (Rhodes, 1990a). If the beliefs and strategies of Deming were accepted, Rhodes (1990b) suggests that it begin at the very top of the organization where all employees are involved in the same problem-solving processes--"how to meet the learning needs of the children for whom they are responsible" (p. 25). Everyone in the system is not only involved in studying the system but also sharing ideas on how to improve it, while learning from those experiences coupled with each person's innate need to be effective. It was within this construct that Rocheleau (1991) suggests some concepts in adopting the Deming total quality philosophy: (a) determine the difference between manager and leader, (b) keep current systems and processes in place until something else has been designed to take its place, (c) remove fear from the workplace and open the channels of communication, (d) build consensus through team and esteem-building activities, and (e) bring in consultants to provide training for all employees. The goal is to shift the existing culture and climate paradigm in the organization. Rocheleau contends

this is not an easy process nor does it happen quickly--it takes time.

The Deming approach is a systems approach. The objective is to quit blaming people for problems and start fixing the system from which the problem stems. The Deming approach believes in shared responsibility in that 85% of change must come from the top. This does not mean that the top does everything, it simply means that they should empower others to share responsibility and give them the guidance and training they need to perform using the new concepts.

While Deming's 14 points/principles of quality for organization have been traditionally applied to industry and business settings, Melvin (1991, November) translated them as they may apply to the school system setting:

1. Create constancy of purpose--all school staff members, administrators, and board members work through consensus building to develop a mission statement.

2. Adopt a new philosophy--administration staff and board recognize the need for organizational change, participate in total quality training activities that provide team-building and problem-solving tools to assist in breaking away from the old mold, and implement the new tools in the organization.

3. Cease dependence on inspection to achieve quality--look at new ways to assess student performance other than through grading, grouping, retraining, and labeling.

4. End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag--this principle can take several forms but the essence is to look at who the suppliers are. For elementary schools, day care centers, preschools, and Headstart programs are the suppliers. For the district's Human Relations Department, schools, district department, and consulting firms are examples of suppliers. The bottom line is, no matter who the suppliers are, the focus of the mission is what can be done to assure that all students are promoted with the skills and attitudes for the next higher level of expected outcomes.

5. Constantly improve the system of production and service--continually use the Deming Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle in every production process. In other words, implement a feedback loop in problem-solving situations.

6. Institute training on the job--there are no quick fixes to changing the culture and climate of an organization. A long-term commitment to staff and organizational development is only realized when training and support of effective school strategies are implemented.

7. Institute leadership--equip school leaders with the management strategies that will assist staff with the skills and knowledge they need to do a better job.

8. Drive out fear--create a work atmosphere of respect and trust and one in which risks can be taken, mistakes made and learned from, and continual learning is a goal for all.

9. Break down barriers between departments--challenge everyone to get involved, collaboratively, in the mission. This can be accomplished by establishing teams.

10. Eliminate slogans--generally every district department and school has a slogan. Slogans are meaningless unless the system is changed to allow for the slogan to fulfill its true meaning. Training is the continuum that makes this a reality.

11. Eliminate work standards or quotas--provide continual training and opportunities to apply that training in the work setting. Adaptations of problem-solving strategies for a team will allow the team to make better, not more, decisions.

12. Remove barriers that inhibit workers in doing their jobs--review existing management and operating system and assess whether it supports or inhibits improvement.

13. Institute a vigorous program of education and self-improvement, revest in the people resource, provide staff development activities as well as opportunities for alternative assignments.

14. Put everyone in the organization to work to accomplish the transformation--train and involve staff in

total quality management skills and assess their effectiveness in meeting the district's mission.

Several school districts implementing Deming's TQM philosophy as reported by Melvin (1991, Summer), Melvin (1991, November), Rhodes (1990a, 1990b), and Rocheleau (1991) indicate a wide range of successes in both central office departments and individual schools. Many believe it is the wave of the future for education but caution prevails. Rhodes' (1992) definition of TQM, "a value-based, information-driven management process through which the minds and talents of people at all levels are applied fully and creatively to the organization's continuous improvement" (p. 76) implies where caution may be warranted. Change is slow and painful. However, given the people barriers to overcome, their natural resistance to change and the avoidance of a change effort, change is still possible. When inherent connections, possibilities, and relationships begin to appear and are recognized, change will occur. However, the leadership must be consistent, the systems effective, and a basic understanding should prevail among members (Rhodes, 1990a). As people begin to see things through the eyes of the customer (e.g., the students) and they are considered part of the whole team, success is realized. When the connections between the central office and the classrooms are made and a realization that their basic goals are the same, then change is likely to occur.

For certain, many other possibilities and relationships exist, all of which will gradually emerge as both the central office and the schoolhouse view the education process in a systematic perspective.

The conduit through which the parallel systems of a school district, the central office and the schoolhouse, can change as suggested by Melvin (1991, Summer) is to "study the literature on organization development" (p. 20). He further contends that one or two motivational speakers or a workshop is not enough. However, it can spawn the interest of boards of education and administrators so that they will want to become more familiar with the change process and the application of Deming's 14 points to schools. The experience to which Melvin (1991, Summer) speaks has in the past yielded three predictions: (a) ties with outside consultants and specialists to furnish information will be called upon; (b) interest in Deming's theories and training that include his 14 points as applied to education will surface; and (c) more frequent requests for training inclusive of related concepts other than Deming's for the first year will be made. Deming's concept of total quality management is not the "be all, end all" to education restructuring. It does provide school districts with a new perspective on restructuring.

Bolman and Deal (1991) state that errors and chaos are an everyday occurrence in managerial life. They attribute

this to the fact that organizations are "complex, surprising, deceptive, and ambiguous" (p. 38) and are difficult for managers and administrators to understand or manage. In this regard, most managers experience failure, frustration, cynicism, and powerlessness because of the complexity, ambiguity, values, and social, economical, and political pressures within the world in which they work. Growth, achievement, and progress are oftentimes missing in a manager's life because of the structure, climate, and culture of the organization. Because of this organizational perspective, Bolman and Deal offer reframing as a tool to assist organizational leaders in restructuring so that they can bring meaning out of confusion and return some sense of stability to organizational life.

To this end, Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest looking at the organization through frames--the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames--that assist organizational leaders understand what is going on and what they can do about it. More specifically, the structural frame focuses on the organizational configuration in terms of roles and relationships in accomplishing tasks; the human resource frame focuses on people and how to maximize their effectiveness and productivity; the political frame is centered around power, bargaining, and negotiating agents in the various organizational coalitions, both inside and

outside of the organization; and the symbolic frame deals with its culture.

Leaders operate within each frame in the organizational configuration, each fitting a particular circumstance and creating a different set of internal dynamics. It is the understanding of the dynamics that is essential to restructuring the organization.

The purpose of restructuring an organization using the frames concept is for leaders to understand their own frames and their limits. For example,

> Structural leaders can become great social architects who build an analysis of an organization's environment at its capacities into a powerful structure and strategy. Human resource leaders can become catalysts who lead through caring, support, accessibility, and empowerment. Effective political leaders are advocates who are clear about their agenda and sensitive to political reality and who build alliances that they need to move their organization forward. Symbolic leaders are artists, poets, or prophets who use symbols and stories to communicate a vision that builds faith and loyalty among an organization's employees and other stakeholders. (Bolman & Deal, 1991, pp. 444-445)

The focus here is that the leaders realize their own strengths, work to enrich them, and build teams that will provide leadership in all four frames.

Spencer (1990) presents reframing in another perspective called strategic reframing. While the research regarding this concept focuses on a problem-solving strategy, the function is not to solve the problem, but to

restructure the situation so that sub-problems will emerge and are solvable. It is also applicable as a managerial tool to improve employee relations, efficiency, and productivity.

Strategic reframing is based on four principles:

1. Recognize established strategic frames; that is, look at the organizational climate and culture through performance constraints, development of bad ideas, and environmental perceptions. The purpose is to gain a sense of how employees perceive the organization and its behaviors. Spencer (1990) contends that "identification is the first step toward change" (p. 6).

2. Search for different points of view. Through role playing, examine each segment in the organization--systems, processes, and employees--and opposites.

3. Generate new ideas through play. Browse through places crowded with toys, antiques, artifacts, or anything not deliberately sought to stimulate the creative juices. Spencer (1990) contends this activity spawns new insights.

4. Give up the need to be right at every step. This is believed to be the major obstacle in creating new ideas. Spencer (1990) suggests that one must be willing to consider ideas that are "ridiculous, preposterous, or just plain wrong" (p. 7).

Unlike Bolman and Deal (1991), Spencer (1990) does not suggest supportive measures to implement strategic reframing

in organizations or problem-solving situations. However, Bolman and Deal suggest training for work teams in group dynamics, team-building, consensus building, decision making, and problem solving for all involved in the reframing initiatives. They also recommend involvement and support for the top.

Hunnicutt (1987) reports that contemporary educational structures want "prosperity and harmony in the workplace" (p. 138), questions how it can be achieved, and responds that the key just might be involving faculty and staff in the decision-making process. To this, Hunnicutt proposes the implementation of "a formal, institutionalized mechanism for productive and participative problem-solving interaction among employees" (p. 138) known as quality circles.

The basic ideas underlying the implementation of the quality circles concept is toward involving all members in the decision-making process (Bowman, 1989; Honeycutt, 1989). Membership is voluntary and the numbers in the group may vary. In an effort to enhance communication within the organization, a facilitator is used. Goals are accomplished by teams through cooperation and collaboration.

For quality circles to be effective, Hunnicutt (1987) and Honeycutt (1989) suggest that changes in the organizational culture need to be made--adaptations, such as gaining financial support, securing trained leadership, training all members in problem-solving processes,

evaluating progress, and making a whole-hearted commitment to the concept. While many organizations espouse participative values, most behave in manners inconsistent with that philosophy (Bowman, 1989).

To implement the quality circles concept, Bowman (1989) suggests: (a) diagnosing the organization's readiness, (b) determining the most appropriate management theory, (c) providing time for adequate planning, (d) establishing realistic expectations, (e) selecting responsible personnel, and (f) recognizing that the implementation implies a change in organizational philosophy.

Quality circles is a participative management technique (Hunnicutt, 1987) not a program (Bowman, 1989). There is substantial opportunity to implement quality circles in education. Hunnicutt contends that "administrators, faculty, and staff must become an integrated unit if educational structures . . . are to survive and flourish" (p. 140).

Shonk (1992) suggests developing a team environment in the organization to foster employee relations, productivity, and effectiveness. Larson and LaFasto (1989) provide an elaborate definition of a team:

> A team has two or more people; it has a specific performance objective or recognizable goal to be attained; and coordination of activity among the members of the team is required for the attainment of the team goal or objective (p. 19).

Usually companies organize teams to empower employees to contribute more fully to the organization and to increase productivity. In order to organize teams, Shonk (1992) suggests that some determination be made as to the organization's readiness to implement teams. That is, take a look at the existing teams in the organization and analyze what needs to be done to support teamwork. Bonser (1992) supports looking at the organizational culture before grappling with the development of teams to resolve problems. Once the decision is made that teamwork seems the logical approach, leaders are identified and their leadership behaviors are assessed. Both Shonk and Larson and LaFasto believe that no team is successful in an environment where trust does not exist.

The research conducted by Larson and LaFasto (1989) revealed that "working well together" (p. 85) was a fundamental ingredient to team success. This concept is characterized in one of two ways. First, it was related to roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities, or clear lines of communication, record keeping, and documentation. Second, working well together was characterized by the relationships among team members or between the team and its leader. The ultimate meaning of working well together was trust. This included honesty, openness, consistency, and respect. To this, Larson and LaFasto maintain that with trust gone between individuals, there is no hope for a team

to function. Collaboration flourishes in a climate of trust because it (a) allows team members to stay problem focused, (b) promotes more efficient communication and coordination, (c) improves the quality of collaborative outcomes, and (d) leads to compensating.

Team trust and collaboration result in employee involvement and autonomy. According to Larson and LaFasto (1989), trust and collaboration come from team members being involved in planning the attack, working out strategies for accomplishing the goal, and knowing the team's approach and how it fits together. "Collaborative climate is the essence of teams; it is the teamwork" (Larson & LaFasto, 1989, p. 94).

The literature substantiates training of all team members. No system can work without training (Rocheleau, 1991); team membership training is key to implementing a problem-solving process (Honeycutt, 1989, Siu-Runyan & Heart, 1992); training and retraining can assist as well as provide a useful analytical tool (Melvin, 1991, Summer; 1991, November); continuous improvement requires new training approaches (Greenwood & Kobu, 1990); and training employees is key to the primary problem-solving process because it heightens the confidence level and provides essential knowledge to overcome constraints in the problem-solving process.

Maul and Bailey (1992) and Shonk (1992) maintain that change efforts should begin with training of individuals, forming teams, defining the mission, establishing trust, and demonstrating a sincere interest in accomplishing the goals of the mission. Shonk (1992) continues that this strategy may differ, depending on whether the team effort is being implemented in a new or existing organization. Unlike the other authors offering solution strategies, Shonk provides tools for looking at each part of the organization, vis-a-vis the team perspective.

Description of Selected Solution

The writer selected the solution strategy suggested by Shonk (1992) in Team Based Organizations and planned to infuse TQM concept in the implementation. Since the work setting already functioned in a quasi team environment, the team concept was the most appropriate and applicable to the work environment. In addition, Shonk's book was designed for organizations to use as is in developing a successful team environment. It contained instruments designed to assess: (a) whether teams might improve organizational effectiveness, (b) the readiness of the existing organization to implement teams and the areas the organization needs to focus on for a change effort, and (c) leader behaviors with respect to how they will function in a team environment and the areas in which they might need to strengthen team leadership behaviors.

Team-Based Organizations (Shonk, 1992) also contained the overreaching TQM concept of the systems approach, involvement of all employees, customer-focus, connectedness and interrelationship of services and products, and training. To this end, the writer anticipated that the goals and expected outcomes would be realized.

The writer shared the outline with the department director and unit directors. They approved the implementation. In addition, both were provided reading material on TQM and the TEAM concepts. Copies of Team-Based Organizations by Shonk (1992) were ordered and distributed to each unit. Verbal permission from Shonk to use the team assessment questions was secured.

The writer contacted a former Florida Power and Light (FPL) employee, a former military academy professor and current doctoral candidate, and a current Nova doctoral candidate, who are now district-level administrators, to provide minitraining sessions on change, team leadership, meeting skills, conflict resolution skills, problem-solving techniques, socio-technical systems, group facilitation skills, group processes and dynamics, team building, interpersonal skills, consensus building, participation meeting and role identification.

The Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire was designed (see Appendix D). The writer contacted a local business that was using teams and problem-solving strategies

to improve employee relations and organizational productivity and effectiveness for a field trip.

The writer arranged with the department director and unit directors to conduct unit team development activities, and time was allocated during regular staff meetings for team development activities.

In implementing the solution strategies, the writer faced challenges that necessitated a revamping of the basic goals and expected outcomes. In this regard, the writer followed the advice of the literature which suggested to start small since change was not only slow but painful.

Coupled with the challenges that occurred in the first month of implementation, a two-pronged approach to the solution was developed. The first was to broaden the knowledge-base and increase the awareness level of department members about the TQM philosophy and concept. The second prong was to implement the designed solution strategy by beginning with a small unit in the department more willing and ready to accept and implement change.

The writer overplanned activities for the time frame of the practicum implementation. At the midpoint, several activities were eliminated and a realization, as the literature suggested, occurred. Time, in conjunction with the leader change element, became significant factors in the solution planned. Had the training activities been spread over a 2-year period, the solution strategy would have been

much more realistic. Additionally, if all the departmental leaders had been given more time to alter their mindset within the confines of the existing organizational culture, the solution suggested would have been fully realized. The literature did suggest caution in this area.

The central focus became implementing the solution strategy with a five-member unit that had 60 part-time trainers who presented over 325 workshops during the school year for over 8,400 noninstructional and supervisory personnel in the district. On the other hand, objectives for the entire department became three-fold: (a) knowledge of TQM, (b) awareness of the need for change, and (c) identification of some areas of change. Again, the literature was on target; that is, to start small because change usually takes place in small pockets of an organization first.

The writer believed the solution strategies that took the TQM systems approach through teaming, was customer focused, involved all employees, showed the connectedness and interrelatedness of services and products coupled with related team training would foster employee relations and increase productivity and effectiveness. To this end, the writer's goal was to assist the unit director and staff in evaluating (a) how teaming would improve their effectiveness, (b) their readiness to change, (c) areas of change, and (d) methods of bringing about change. It was

anticipated that these actions would lead the unit to using a variety of problem-solving techniques in their unit planning sessions as well as daily operations.

Report of Action Taken

During the implementation phase, the writer established objectives and supporting activities to meet the objectives. The following events were scheduled over the 8-month period. Initially, the writer introduced the project to the department director to discuss a presentation strategy for the remainder of the administrative staff. To this end, the Interdependence Questionnaire (see Appendix A) was sent to each administrator with instructions on how to complete and return it because of individual schedules and time constraints. It was designed to determine the amount of interdependence within the organization, stimulate thinking, and generate discussion among the members of the department about the advantages and disadvantages of increased emphasis on teamwork. As instructed, each person was to respond to the questions by placing an N above the number for the statement that best described the organization now and F above the statement that would be more desirable for the future. The administrators were requested to respond to each question with a cross-functional focus as well as focusing on activities within each work unit. Statements were listed on a linear continuum numbers 1, 2, and 3. According to the scale, the higher the rating (more

individuals responding to 3) the higher the interdependence on each other and the greater the need for teamwork.

The responses were returned and shared with the department director. The unit directors presented split view points and provided comments regarding the time required for implementation. The director then requested that the writer modify the expected outcomes and develop an alternative implementation strategy for the department that was more akin to the existing operational paradigm. To this end, the director agreed to three expected outcomes: (a) to increase the knowledge-base of all department members about TQM concepts; (b) to assist department members in recognizing that change is needed; and (c) to assist department administrators in focusing in on one area in need of change. The alternative implementation strategy for the department included having one-on-one discussions about TQM, securing a TQM expert to conduct a knowledge-awareness training session for the entire department, and conducting individual discussions with unit directors regarding areas where change might occur. The originally designed solution strategy was implemented in a writer-selected unit of the department after a discussion with the unit director.

Beginning with the second month and the alternative implementation strategy in place, the writer began conducting miniconversations with the selected unit. The unit team consisted of the unit director, two staff

assistants, two clerical support persons, and 60 part-time trainers. The project was introduced during the first week. The entire unit was excited about the possibility of working as a team and, more importantly, having an opportunity to provide input regarding tasks, daily operations, and unit decisions.

The Gregorc Mind Style Delineator was administered. The instrument was chosen because of its validity and reliability in determining how individuals process and channel information. In addition, it provides insight as to how and why individuals respond to situations. The instrument focuses on one's perception with respect to concreteness or abstractness and ordering (sequentialness or randomness).

The four mind styles are abstract random (AR), abstract sequential (AS), concrete random (CR), or concrete sequential (CS). According to Gregorc, the AR's natural abilities include creativity, sensitivity, flexibility, ability to reflect, and a preference for being part of a group. AS's natural abilities include debating, judging, seeking answers, and gathering and analyzing information and ideas. CR's natural abilities include experimenting, creating change, and unusual approaches, curiosity, and independence. CS's natural abilities include logical working step-by-step, planning and organizing in the finest detail, following directions, and practical based on facts.

Once the results of the instrument are known and shared with others, interpersonal relationship skills and communication skills are enhanced. The results from the Gregorc were used to (a) develop a conversation around teaming (b) determine how they could enhance the group, and (c) how they could facilitate group productivity.

The director and the two staff assistants were given the Readiness Planning Questionnaire (see Appendix B). Questions 2, 4, and 7 were eliminated because they were not applicable. The questionnaire was designed to assist leaders in identifying areas to focus on that might be in need of change. In addition, it also assisted in prompting discussion on how to proceed in the change effort.

The results of the Readiness Planning Questionnaire (see Appendices B-1 and B-2) were determined and shared with the unit administrators during the fourth week. To determine if the unit viewed themselves different from the department because of the few weeks of implementation, the Readiness Questionnaire was given twice, once with a focus on the department and the other on the unit.

The writer introduced the systems concept the third month. A system was defined as a group of initiatives done by several individuals to result in an end product. Several systems within the unit were identified. The systems involved both individuals within the unit and outside of the unit. Having become aware of this approach, the writer next

introduced the concepts of internal and external customer. The weekly conversation ended with the team being challenged to seek ways to improve at least one system.

The writer administered the Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire (see Appendix D) to determine the techniques currently used. The problem-solving techniques introduced by the writer were brainstorming, data collection, triple ranking, pareto analysis, checklists, observation, and focus group.

These techniques were discussed again and in more detail in the next two weekly sessions. Practice time was also allotted. At the end of the third month, the group indicated that they had used all five of the problem-solving techniques in a variety of ways within the unit. The Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire was administered again.

During the fourth month, the writer debriefed the staff regarding their list of organizational systems and changes that were occurring. Several discussed systems were under consideration: an evaluation system and plans to disseminate a workshop initiation system to other department units.

At the midpoint, the writer administered the Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire (see Appendix D) to each team member. All but five problem-solving techniques were eliminated. Arrangements were made for the department to

visit Motorola's Team Fair in the fifth month. Department members were given a VIP escort and tour. Provisions were made to discuss team development and implementation strategies within the Motorola organization. Motorola employees gave tips as well as pitfalls when implementing the team approach. Interviews were conducted with all levels of the Motorola organization and with specific company teams. In the succeeding three weeks, there were discussions about the Motorola visit and how the information learned could be applied to the work environment.

From observation, the writer realized that the team needed more time to apply the problem-solving techniques during their regularly scheduled and unscheduled staff meetings and planning sessions. It was also observed that leader behaviors significantly changed as the team rather than group concept emerged.

A half-day TQM awareness training session was arranged for the 35-member department by two experts, Doctors Harrington and Presiosi of the School of Entrepreneurship of Nova Southeastern University. These experts made several key points in the training session: (a) change is unsettling and most difficult for TOP management, however, it is necessary to enhance the productivity of the organization, (b) Total Quality Management (TQM) or continuous quality improvement (CQI) is a mindset, and

(c) TQM is not always business driven; it appears to be education driven. The latter point was made to emphasize the importance of training. In addition, it was indicated that one essential reason the TQM concept is considered in organizations is to exceed the expectations of the customer. Throughout the session, it was suggested that commitment from the top with respect to training was an essential ingredient along with trust, rapport, integrity, and fairness. Without these, a TQM initiative was doomed.

During the next 2 weeks, the team had an opportunity to reflect on the training session. They discussed how far they had come as a team and what they could do to make themselves more effective and efficient in delivery of services and products to the customer. The last session during the seventh month was a brainstorming session on how they could assist others in becoming more team oriented.

The last three sessions involved several one-on-one group discussions between the writer and the team. The Problem-Solving Technique Questionnaire (see Appendix D) and Team Leadership Continuum (see Appendix C) were given to each team member to complete. At the last of the three sessions, the team informed the writer of their desire to produce responses to the questionnaires made by consensus in the meeting. For each item on the nine-item Team Leadership Continuum, the team reached consensus and then shared their individual opinions. The team members tallied their use of

the various problem-solving techniques and reported the results. After the questionnaires were completed, the writer observed the group for their final session.

During the last week, the writer analyzed the data derived from the implementation. A comparison of the Leadership Continuum and Problem-Solving Techniques questionnaires were made. At the regularly scheduled team meeting, the writer provided an overview of their progress and expressed a heartfelt "thank you" for their support.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

Most school administrators are ill-equipped to handle the challenges presented in education today. Operational modalities and strategies are outdated for current-day issues and mandates. One educator indicated that the lag time between business and education is 34 years for operational modalities and strategies. The writer's intent, to engage central office unit personnel in activities that would facilitate change, was a priority. To this end, the central office personnel were encouraged to participate in planned team-building and problem-solving activities to increase employee relations, productivity, and effectiveness. Initially, the writer was not cognizant or did not want to accept that people were not only reluctant to change but indeed resisted it. However, within the first month of implementation the writer realized that many indicated they wanted teaming yet were resistant to the concept.

The anticipated outcomes for departmental involvement were partly realized. However, for the writer's unit and a selected unit, the anticipated outcomes were fully realized. During the 8-month period, it was anticipated that 29

employees would participate in the departmental activities, however, 7 full-time employees participated in the full-scale implementation with impact on 83 part-time trainers who conducted over 350 workshops that serviced over 8,800 participants (over 400 teachers and 8,400 noninstructional supervisory personnel).

After the first month, the alternative solution strategy was implemented for the seven full-time department members. The report will focus on the seven full-time central office department members (two teams--a two-member team and a five-member team).

First, the existing structure and culture of the department does not lend itself to staff members becoming major contributors in the operations of the entire department. The Interdependence Questionnaire (see Appendix A) was administered to the core group of administrators during the first month of implementation. The results of the completed questionnaires indicated that there was a desire for more teamwork within the department as evidenced by the higher ratings given to each question. The responses were shared with the director who then wanted to meet with the administrators to discuss them.

The core group of administrators met and discussed each question. Overall, each unit administrator agreed that the entire department should be more interdependent. On the other hand, they also agreed that each functional unit

should maintain some autonomy because of their role in addressing specific target audiences.

The results of the questionnaire substantiated prevailing reasons given in the literature about change, that it is painful and slow. Results derived from the questions indicate that most administrators agree that the department functions within each unit but there should be more cross-functional endeavors and teamwork. Comments were made to support the disparity. One administrator stated in the comment section to question 3A, How is work accomplished?, "If we pooled our resources, trainers, types of services and the like, we could be more productive." While another administrator commented in general, "I am not convinced that the units in the department really need to cross function. Much of what each unit accomplishes primarily impacts on the specific audiences it serves. The real issue would be that the units meet the needs of their own groups which would then impact on the goal of the department as a whole." The opposing opinions generated a lively discussion that resulted in the split implementation.

The seven administrators responded to the questionnaire as follows:

Question 1: How are goals accomplished?

Three administrators indicated that goals are now accomplished by individual effort, while four indicated that

goals are accomplished by two or more functions coordinating their efforts.

Seven administrators indicated that in the future goals should be accomplished by several functions coordinating their efforts.

Question 2: How are resources allocated?

Five administrators indicated that now functions have their own separate resources, while two indicated that functions share some common resources.

Seven administrators indicated that for the future large parts of the organization should share and allocate common resources.

Question 3: How is work accomplished?

Five administrators indicated that work is now accomplished by working alone, while two indicated that work is accomplished by some functions coordinating their activities.

Seven administrators indicated that for the future work should be accomplished by all functions coordinating their activities.

Question 4: How is planing done?

Two administrators indicated that planning and progress feedback is now done individually, while five indicated that planning and progress feedback is done in subgroups.

For the future, six indicated that planning and progress feedback should be done by a collection of functions/departments, while one indicated that planning and progress feedback should be done in subgroups.

Question 5: How are we communicating?

Six administrators indicated that communications now are primarily within functions, while one indicated there is some cross-functional communication.

Four administrators indicated that in the future frequent cross-functional communications are needed, while three indicated that some cross-functional communication is needed.

Question 6: What type of meetings are held?

Three administrators indicated that now meetings are mostly held within a function, while four indicated that some meetings are cross-functional.

For the future, six indicated that frequent cross-functional or total organization meetings are needed, while one indicated that some meetings should be cross-functional.

Question 7: How are decisions made?

Four administrators indicated that decisions are now made individually and do not impact the work of others, while three indicated that decisions are made by two or more people and impact the work of others.

For the future, five indicated that decisions should be made by consensus of several functions, while two indicated that decisions should be made by two or more people.

Question 8: What is the time frame for coordination across functions?

Six administrators indicated that now functions work for months before coordination is needed, while one indicated that coordination is needed weekly.

For the future, five indicated that activities must be coordinated on a daily basis, while two indicated that coordination is needed weekly.

The department received TQM awareness training and the writer's unit and the writer-selected unit received full-scale implementation. Weekly team-building sessions revealed a group of employees who were excited about the possibility of working as a team and having the opportunity to provide input regarding tasks, daily operations, and unit decisions.

The Gregorc Mind Style Delineator was administered to provide the unit members with insight as to how and why individuals respond to situations and to better utilize individual skills based on how he/she perceives things. The table below shows the results of the writer-selected unit members. The unit is represented by all mind styles and should function well as a team.

Table 1

Breakdown of the Mind Styles in the Unit

Person's Title	Mind Style
Director	CS
Staff Assistant 1	AS
Staff Assistant 2	CR
Clerical 1	AR
Clerical 2	CR

The resulting conversation that followed sharing the results revealed that knowing one's mind style helped the unit members to understand each other better, communicate more effectively, and plan their work more effectively and efficiently. One person stated, "This is great, we can really work as a team now because we know each other better."

The Readiness Planning Questionnaire (see Appendix B) was administered to the unit twice. The first time was to focus on the department to determine if the unit viewed itself differently from the department after a few weeks of implementation. The second time was to focus on the unit. The questionnaire was designed to assist leaders (administrators) in identifying areas to focus on that might be in need of change and to assist in prompting discussion on how to proceed in the change effort. Questions 2, 4, and 7 were eliminated because they were not applicable. The unit was more ready for change than the department. Most change efforts were already in progress. Areas on the

questionnaire indicating a need of change were identified and said to be areas directly related to departmental change. This is evidenced in questions 6, 9, 11, 12, and 13.

The unit viewed itself differently from the department on the Readiness Planning Questionnaire. This questionnaire was administered to the three administrators in the unit: two staff assistants and one unit director.

Item 1: Management's understanding and support of the need to change.

The unit indicated that at present and in the future there is and should be thorough understanding and commitment to change. With respect to the department, one felt that there was poor understanding or no visible support; one felt that there was little understanding or token support; and one felt that there was fair understanding or some visible support. They all felt that there should be a thorough understanding and commitment to change in the future.

Item 3: Top management goals for change.

The unit indicated that some goals were defined and interest in long-term benefits for the organization and employees are present. In terms of the future, the unit indicated that goals should be clear, committed to long-term increase in organization effectiveness and job satisfaction. The unit felt that the department top management's goals for change were unclear, limited, and somewhat defined at

present. For the future, they felt that there should be a long-term commitment.

Item 5: Benefits of increasing employee involvement in planning and decision making.

The unit felt that there was moderate benefit at present and that there should be high benefit for the future. They were not optimistic for the department at the present indicating little to moderate benefit but futuristically there should be benefit.

Item 6: Middle management's attitude toward change.

The unit rated themselves and the department with two indicating that middle management's attitude toward change was presently cautious, and one indicating that they were interested in trying. All three indicated that the unit and department should be eager to respond and be involved in change.

Item 8: Supervisors' and manager's interpersonal communications and team management skills.

The unit rated the supervisors' and managers' interpersonal communication and team management skills for the present and future as excellent. The unit rated the department's skills and communication as fair and good.

Item 9: Commitment of resources.

The existing department structure does not allow for too much input with regard to resources, however, the desire is that there would be more involvement in the future.

Item 10: Training.

The unit viewed itself and the department the same. That is, all three indicated that training occurs presently and that it should be ongoing in the future.

Item 11: Commitment to a realistic time frame.

The unit viewed itself and the department the same. Presently, one expected results to exceed costs within one year, and two expected results to exceed costs within 2 or 3 years. For the future, all three expected results to exceed costs when the change becomes an ongoing part of company culture.

Item 12: Organizational continuity and predictability.

The unit viewed itself and the department the same for the present and the future because of the reorganization the school district is currently undergoing.

Item 13: History of change efforts.

The unit indicated that change efforts in the unit and department have been somewhat unsuccessful presently, but the initiative taken with the practicum was positive. They

indicated that the efforts should be very successful in the future for both.

Item 14: Employee's support.

The unit indicated that they were very supportive for this effort and will be highly supportive in the future. The unit was not as optimistic about the department indicating that presently employees in the department were somewhat skeptical and in the future might be willing to give change a try.

The writer administered the Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire (see Appendix D) and introduced seven techniques: brainstorming, data collection, checklists, observation, focus group, triple ranking, and pareto analysis. The team was then charged to (a) meet, (b) outline the system that needed to improve, (c) identify a problem within the system, (d) select a problem-solving technique, (e) utilize the technique, and (f) report the findings in the next meeting.

In the days following the meeting, the writer observed the team in their planning sessions. The team appeared to have been most comfortable with brainstorming. The writer also realized that too many techniques had been given from which the team was to select. At this point, the writer decided to limit the problem-solving techniques to brainstorming, focus group, data collection, observation,

and checklists, and develop activities around using them in their daily operations and annual planning sessions.

After 4 weeks of using problem-solving techniques, the questionnaire was administered again. The results indicated that brainstorming had been used nine times, data collection three times, checklists two times, observation zero, and focus group two times.

Table 2 indicates problem-solving techniques implemented and used in the unit.

Table 2

Problem-Solving Techniques Implemented and Used in Unit

Problem-Solving Techniques	Times Used Before	Times Used After	Comments
Brainstorming	Most Commonly Used	9	Used weekly since introduced
Data Collection	Occasionally or as projects are assigned Twice/Year	3	Used to gather information for three projects
Checklists	On Occasion	2	Used to get input from two groups
Observation	0	5	Used to gather information about trainer delivery
Focus Group		2	Used to make decisions in the advisory group

The field trip to Motorola prompted discussions about how they could use what they learned in their unit. Two

meetings were scheduled to review the information from Motorola and to plan some type of employee recognition activity. The team leader (unit director) treated the unit to lunch.

The team continued to use the problem-solving techniques. The unit director continually asked for input as well, or it was freely given by any member of the unit. In the one-on-one and group discussion it was revealed and observed that all members of the unit capitalized on knowing each other's mind style, in both unit director-to-staff member communication and group communication as well. In 5 of the 15 staff meetings observed, the unit director opened the meeting first by giving recognition to the unit members for a job well done.

Four major projects were produced by the unit during the implementation period. For each project, the purpose and function of the project were identified and its connectedness and interrelatedness to the district's overall mission were discussed. Roles and responsibilities were identified and discussed, specific tasks were outlined based on skills, potential obstacles and barriers were discussed, and project parameters and time lines were established. A basic outline was generated by the members of the unit when concerns and issues were discussed. This outline consisted of the following items: (a) items we can control, (b) items we cannot control, (c) input from other sources, (d) need

for specific assistance or specialized tasks, (e) need to train others in the project function, (f) process for gathering information, and (g) uses of information. For each of the seven items mentioned, the questions who, what, where, and how, were answered. The writer further observed that while a project might involve a unit member that had specialized technical expertise, all unit members were familiar with the task and took part in assisting that individual.

Finally, the Team Leadership Continuum questionnaire was administered to the group and a group consensus was obtained (see Appendix C). The questionnaire was designed to illustrate team leadership behaviors in nine categories: (a) goal setting, (b) planning, (c) organization structures, (d) roles, (e) decision making, (f) meeting, (g) communications, (h) control, and (i) performance feedback. The scale ranks from 1 as low (individual-centered leadership) to 3 as high (team-centered leadership). The group consensus ranked the unit as 3 in all categories except 3, 5, and 7. These three categories were ranked 2 or 3 with an explanation.

Item 1: Goal setting.

The unit ranked itself as 3; that is, the team sets team goals and the manager ensures fit with the larger organization.

Item 2: Planning.

The unit ranked itself as 3; that is, the team plans and the manager coordinates plans with other units.

Item 3: Organization structure.

The unit ranked itself as 2, a flat structure with the leader as part of the team; and 3, a flat structure where the leader manages boundary and is a resource to the team. An explanation followed: "Oftentimes the organization's hierarchial structure will surface. We still operate in a crisis management mode."

Item 4: Roles.

The unit ranked roles 3; that is, the team has responsibility within defined limits and the leader manages boundary and is a resource to the team.

Item 5: Decision making.

Decision making was ranked 2, the team and leader decide consensus; and 3, the team decides within defined limits. The explanation followed: "Internal unit decisions are ranked 3. Organization decisions are ranked 2. Situational leadership is an influential factor causing the team to respond within defined limits."

Item 6: Meetings.

Meetings were ranked 3; that is, the team sets agenda and meets without boundary manager, leadership rotates, and

manager is a resource. The explanation followed: "The manager is very observant and generally includes items we want to discuss. However, he has an open philosophy for all of us to add items to the agenda."

Item 7: Communications.

Communications ranked 2, a team responsibility with all team members and leader in the communications loop; and 3, the team keeps the boundary manager informed and the manager communicates with groups outside the team. The explanation followed: "The situation mandates a ranking of 2 or 3 in the communication loop."

Item 8: Control.

Control ranked 3; that is, the team exercises control and the boundary manager is kept informed.

Item 9: Performance feedback.

Performance feedback was ranked 3; that is, the team assesses team's performance, and the boundary manager provides input. The explanation followed: "The team assesses itself in terms of their job performance. We usually tell each other how they are doing."

Discussion

The research conducted by Larson and LaFasto (1989) suggested that "working well together" (p. 85) was a fundamental ingredient to team success. The concept is characterized in one of two ways: (a) roles,

responsibilities, and accountabilities, or clear lines of communication, record keeping and documentation, or (b) relationships among team members carrying the ultimate meaning of trust. The literature also substantiates that no system can work without the training of the team members (Rocheleau, 1991) and that training is fundamental to implementing a problem-solving process (Greenwood & Kobu, 1990; Honeycutt, 1989; Melvin, 1991, Summer; Melvin, 1991, November; Siu-Runyan & Heart, 1992).

Additionally, Maul and Bailey (1982) and Shonk (1992) maintain that change efforts begin with training of individuals, forming of teams, defining the mission, establishing trust, and demonstrating a sincere interest in accomplishing the goals of the mission. To this end, the writer suggests the use of such strategies in central office organizations. The strategies will not only equip central office administrators with the necessary leadership behaviors to meet the demanding challenges of education today, but assist in fostering a work environment that is geared to the customer and employee alike. The inclusion of group activities that lend themselves to a "working well together" tenor can only lead to organizational success. The development of this atmosphere requires administrators to make a commitment to the philosophy, a commitment of their time for training, and an individual realization that the process is no quick fix.

The writer placed a good deal of emphasis on team building activities, an assessment of self, how employees perceive other employees, and how employees perceive the organization and their role in it. It was concluded that while many proclaim they want a more participatory management style, the commitment and dedication to such an initiative is no more than talk. It was reassuring that a few administrators did perceive teaming as the way of doing business and were anxious to receive assistance and move in that direction. It was of primary importance that the dedication and commitment to a change effort be evident in word and deed from top management. Such an environment tends to create the climate of trust that is essential to the success in a team effort. The employees involved in the practicum not only verbally expressed their commitment to the change effort but fostered an environment where working well together was evident in unit services, productivity, and effectiveness.

The writer is uncertain about how one can go about minimizing the fear of administrators have of losing control and power over their organizations. One can only summize that the process would be long-range, perhaps 5 to 10 years, inclusive of a change in attitude and leader behavior from top executives down, as well as training of neophyte and seasoned administrators and natural attrition. This is

indicative of an area in need of exploration and certainly might prove to be a most dynamic practicum one day.

On the other hand, the longevity of the existing education culture, the natural human reluctance to change, and the 34-year lag time between operational strategies in business education present both numerous and complex areas of concern. The only remedy appears to be the marketing of a team effort change training blitz on the profession, primarily linking the connectedness and interrelatedness of central office personnel to the schoolhouse mission.

For too long, education professionals have not linked training of the problem-solving process to worker or job relatedness. The midpoint Problem-Solving Techniques Questionnaire (see Appendix D) administered to the unit, indicated that they were not familiar with the variety of problem-solving techniques available and their potential use. The use of many of these techniques are valuable in two ways: (a) garnering input from others, and (b) promoting both customer and employee buy-in to both process and product.

The writer believes that the introducing of problem-solving techniques to a team while infusing the TQM concept in the process, employee relationships, productivity and effectiveness in the central office unit improved significantly. The team displayed continual interest in the process. The unit director/leader indicated that they were

known as radicals, nonconformists, risk takers, and decision makers who make decisions and take the licks later. No longer did members of the team use the word "I." In the last 3 of the 15 meetings observed, the word "we" surfaced throughout, almost always spoken by various members of the team and sometimes in unison. The words "we can do it" were said on several occasions in the last meeting and in unison twice by the clerical support staff.

As a result of the practicum activities, the team feels that no matter what happens to an individual team member, absence due to illness or personal reasons, the work of the team will not suffer. All members of the team have been cross-functionally trained in each others' specific job tasks.

The unit has also become increasingly aware of the function and purpose of the writer's unit. It is anticipated that the two units will provide several training sessions in the coming school year for the respective target audiences. The underlying premise is based on the fact that supervisors of people, whether noninstructional or instructional, require the same generic leadership skills and behaviors. The posture will begin to communicate a very powerful message to leaders that no longer can they work in isolation. No matter what the specific function is, the bottom line of what is done has to relate to the overarching district mission, education of the children.

The writer warns caution in implementing a change effort. It was made clear, as the literature suggested and what the writer experienced initially, that change efforts will continue to fail because of (a) lack of knowledge of how change occurs (Fullan & Miles, 1992), (b) team involvement and training (Honeycutt, 1989), (c) recognition of connectedness and interrelatedness of central office and schoolhouse (Rhodes, 1992), and (d) management support and involvement (Bonser, 1992; Bowman, 1989; Doyle, 1992; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Honeycutt, 1989; Honnicuttt, 1987; Rhodes, 1990; Rhodes, 1992; Schargel, 1991; Shonk, 1992). The literature also supports the notion that current organizational structure and culture limits the productivity and effectiveness of its natural resources, the people. The need to overhaul the system and it's structure, piece by piece, is warranted. The writer accomplished one piece. Although total commitment from the department did not fully materialize, the unit that did is a start in the right direction. It is anticipated that the teaming and problem-solving interventions over the past 8 months will ultimately spread to the entire department and others as well.

Recommendations

In light of the results generated from this practicum, the writer suggests the following recommendations:

1. The solution strategy suggested is indicative of a 2-year implementation period. This allows time to practice

skills learned through training. In addition, it allows time to monitor, collect data, modify, and provide feedback.

2. Leaders need to be more receptive to change. Working in isolation or for a specific group defeats the mission.

3. Teaming should be cross-functional; afterall, it is more productive if everyone understands the connectedness and interrelationship of the organizational function to the overall mission.

4. Training not only enhances and enriches human resources, particularly, if the focus begins with group dynamics. The outgrowths from this training are limitless.

5. Incorporation of TQM helps to promote collaboration, empowerment and shared decision-making. It also fosters employee relations, productivity, and effectiveness.

6. Trust, the key ingredient to a successful organization, needs to exist and be expressed in both word and deed. Without it, an organization is doomed to fail.

7. Fear of change or loss of power have far reaching implications. The input of many is more worthy than a single effort.

8. Keeping a log or journal of unexpected events will help in maintaining some flexibility in implementing alternatives.

Dissemination

One final note on dissemination of the practicum. Several district executives from different divisions have expressed an interest in the practicum. The practicum will be left at the writer's worksite for districtwide use. Current plans are to implement the solution strategy in a department that has over 900 members. The implementation process will be conducted by the unit involved in this practicum.

The writer will be a campus director for a community college next year. The president has requested implementation for the upcoming school year.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX A

INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of these questions is to determine the amount of interdependence within your organization--that is, the extent of coordination required to accomplish work.

They are intended to be used to stimulate your thinking and generate a discussion with other members of your organization about the advantages or disadvantages of increased emphasis on teamwork.

Instructions: Complete the questions by placing an N above the number for the statement that best describes the organization now, and an F above the statement that is more desirable for the future. List in the comments section some recent examples that illustrate your choice.

The higher the rating, the higher the interdependence and the greater the need for teamwork. The questions can be answered by looking across or within functions, department, or divisions of an organization. Be sure to indicate whether you are answering the questions with a cross-functional focus or focusing within a work unit.

1. How are goals accomplished?

1	2	3
By individual effort.	By two or more functions coordinating their efforts.	By several functions coordinating their efforts.

Comments: _____

_____

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 15-18) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX A

INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

2. How are resources allocated?

1	2	3
Functions have their own separate resources.	Functions share some common resources.	Large parts of the organization share and allocate common resources.

Comments: _____

_____

3. How is work accomplished?

1	2	3
By working alone.	By some functions coordinating their activities.	By all functions coordinating their activities.

Comments: _____

_____

A. Identify major pieces of work that require coordination with others.

_____

_____

Comments: _____

_____

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 15-18) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX A

INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

4. How is planning done?

1	2	3
Planning and progress feedback is done individually.	Planning and progress feedback is done in subgroups.	Planning and progress feedback is done by a collection of functions/ departments.

Comments: _____

_____

5. How are we communicating?

1	2	3
Communications are primarily within functions.	Some cross-functional communication is needed.	Frequent cross-functional communications are needed.

Comments: _____

_____

6. What type of meetings are held?

1	2	3
Meetings are mostly held within a function.	Some meetings are cross-functional.	Frequent cross-functional or total organization meetings are needed.

Comments: _____

_____

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 15-18) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX A

INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

7. How are decisions made?

1	2	3
Decisions are made individually and do not impact the work of others.	Decisions are made by two or more people and impact the work of others.	Decisions are made by consensus of several functions and impact the work of most.

Comments: _____

_____

8. What is the time frame for coordination across functions?

1	2	3
Functions work for months before coordination is needed.	Coordination is needed weekly.	Activities must be coordinated on a daily basis.

Comments: _____

_____

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 15-18) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX A

INTERDEPENDENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

Each person should explain his or her answers for each item and discuss them for understanding. Avoid merely obtaining a numerical average for each question. Rather, strive for an understanding of everyone's point of view.

A consensus should be reached about the desired future level of interdependence. Circle the response that best represents the consensus of how the organization should function in the future.

The higher the number on each scale, the higher the need for teamwork. If responses are always at the left end of each scale, there is a low need for teamwork and the organization should be less concerned about trying to organize around teams.

If there is little interdependence, employees will see little or no value in functioning more effectively together. The farther to the right responses are, the more value employees will see in operating as a team.

High scores on desired future interdependence will indicate the need to create more teamwork. Low scores obviously mean that more teams are not the answer.

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 15-18) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE

The Readiness Planning Questionnaire is designed to assist managers in identifying areas on which to focus when preparing for change. It is also intended to encourage discussion on how to proceed, to identify areas requiring change, and to help determine the scope of change.

Instructions: Put a P next to the description that best fits the organization's present state and an F next to the description that best fits the desired future state in two or three years. You may want to create your own description if none fits your situation.

1. Management's understanding and support of the need to change.

1	2	3	4
Poor understanding; no visible support.	Little understanding; token support.	Fair understanding; some visible support.	Thorough understanding; commitment.

Reasons: _____

_____

*2. Unions' understanding and support of the need to change.

1	2	3	4
Poor understanding; no visible support.	Little understanding; token support.	Fair understanding; some visible support.	Thorough understanding; commitment.

Reasons: _____

_____

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

3. Top management goals for change.

1	2	3	4
Long-term goals unclear, short-term goal is cost reduction.	Limited goal definition and appreciation for long-term benefits.	Some goals defined; interest in long-term benefits for the organization and employees.	Goals clear: committed to long-term increase in organization effectiveness and job satisfaction.

Reasons: _____

_____

*4. Union goals for change.

1	2	3	4
Long-term goals unclear, short-term goal is cost reduction.	Limited goal definition and appreciation for long-term benefits.	Some goals defined; interest in long-term benefits for the organization and employees.	Goals clear: committed to long-term increase in organization effectiveness and job satisfaction.

Reasons: _____

_____

5. Benefits of increasing employee involvement in planning and decision making.

1	2	3	4
No perceived benefit.	Little benefit.	Moderate benefit.	High benefit.

Reasons: _____

_____

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

6. Middle management's attitude toward change.

1	2	3	4
Fear; resent turning over company to employees.	Cautious; concerned about threat to managers' authority.	Interested in trying.	Eager to sponsor and be involved.

Reasons: _____

_____

*7. Union representatives' attitudes toward change.

1	2	3	4
Fear; resent turning over company to employees.	Cautious; concerned about threat to managers' authority.	Interested in trying.	Eager to sponsor and be involved.

Reasons: _____

_____

8. Supervisors' and managers' interpersonal communications and team management skills.

1	2	3	4
Generally poor; no opportunity to apply.	Fair; limited opportunity to apply.	Good; supported by training and various opportunities to apply.	Excellent; consistent effort at all levels on developing and applying skills.

Reasons: _____

_____

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

9. Commitment of resources.

1	2	3	4
No dollars or staffing available.	Assign task as an additional duty and to do within current budget.	Some staff and seed money can be spared on a trial basis.	High-potential line managers are available full time. Budget exists for change effort.

Reasons: _____

_____

10. Training.

1	2	3	4
No time for training.	Train only the people directly involved in teams.	Train teams and management.	Training is an ongoing essential way of operating for everyone.

Reasons: _____

_____

11. Commitment to a realistic time frame.

1	2	3	4
Expect results to immediately exceed costs.	Expect results to exceed costs within one year.	Expect results to exceed costs within two or three years.	Expect results to exceed costs when the change becomes an ongoing part of company culture.

Reasons: _____

_____

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

12. Organizational continuity and predictability.

1	2	3	4
Constant; major organizational changes or layoffs likely.	Possible organizational changes or layoffs.	Predictable future direction; little likelihood of organizational changes or layoffs.	Stable; specific effort made to insure continuity.

Reasons: _____

_____ _____

13. History of change efforts.

1	2	3	4
Just another program; everyone is waiting for it to eventually disappear.	Perfunctory participation and support; little long-term effect.	Earlier efforts somewhat supported and successful.	Earlier efforts supported and very successful.

Reasons: _____

_____

14. Employee's support.

1	2	3	4
Highly skeptical; will not support.	Somewhat skeptical; wait and see.	Willing to give it a try.	Eager to get started; highly supportive.

Reasons: _____

_____

APPENDIX B

READINESS PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE (continued)

General Comments:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 72-77) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX C

TEAM LEADERSHIP CONTINUUM

APPENDIX C

TEAM LEADERSHIP CONTINUUM

The Team Leadership Continuum is an instrument designed to illustrate team leadership behaviors.

Individual-centered Leadership — Team-centered Leadership

Low----------Team Autonomy ----------High

One-on-one Manager	Team Leader	Team Boundary Manager
1	2	3

1. Goal setting.

1	2	3
Manager sets individual goals with each individual.	Team with leader sets team goals.	Team sets team goals. Manager ensures fit with larger organization.

2. Planning.

1	2	3
Manager plans, reviews, and gets input.	Team plans with leader.	Team plans. Manager coordinates plans with other units.

3. Organization structure.

1	2	3
Hierarchy, with clear chain of command.	Flat structure; leader part of team.	Flat structure; leader manages boundary and is a resource to team.

APPENDIX C

TEAM LEADERSHIP CONTINUUM (continued)

4. Roles.

1	2	3
Clearly defined management and employee responsibility.	Shared responsibility. Leader provides some direction and facilitates teamwork.	Team has responsibility within defined limits. Leader manages boundary and is a resource to the team.

5. Decision making.

1	2	3
Manager gets input and decides.	Team and leader decide; consensus.	Team decides within defined limits.

6. Meeting.

1	2	3
Frequently one on one. Manager sets agenda. Manager leads.	Team and leader jointly set agenda and meet. Team leader leads.	Team sets agenda and meets without boundary manager. Leadership rotates. Manager is a resource.

7. Communications.

1	2	3
Mostly one on one and frequently dependent upon manager.	Team responsibility. All team members and leader in the communications loop.	Team keeps boundary manager informed. Manager communicates with groups outside the team.

APPENDIX C

TEAM LEADERSHIP CONTINUUM (continued)

8. Control.

1	2	3
Manager and individual exercise control.	Team and leader exercise control.	Team exercises control. Boundary manager kept informed.

9. Performance feedback.

1	2	3
Manager and individual assess individual's performance.	Team and leader assess team's performance.	Team assesses team's performance. Boundary manager provides input.

Note. From Team-Based Organizations: Developing a Successful Team Environment (pp. 137-139) by James H. Shonk, 1992, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin. Copyright 1992 by Business One Irwin. Reprinted by permission.

APPENDIX D

PROBLEM-SOLVING TECHNIQUES QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D

PROBLEM-SOLVING TECHNIQUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Of the problem-solving techniques presented over the past 7 months, please place a check by the techniques you used to solve problems in a team environment, indicate the date, check whether it was effective or not effective, and provide comments regarding effectiveness.

Problem-Solving Technique	Date Used	Effective	Not Effective	Comments
Brainstorming				
Triple Ranking				
Pareto Analysis				
Data Collection				
Checklists				
Recording Checklists				
Observation				
Focus Group				
Problem Specification				
Fishbone				
Cause & Effect Diagram Adding Cards (CEDAC)				
Force Field Analysis				
Action & Effect Diagram				
Run-it-by				
Project Planning Log				
Lion's Den				

REFERENCE LIST

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bonser, C. F. (1992, September/October). Total quality education? Public Administration Review, 52(5), 504-512.

Bookman, B. (1992, August). Energizing TQM with right-brain thinking. Training, 29(8), 62-66.

Bowman, J. S. (1989, Winter). Quality circles: Promise, problems and prospects in Florida. Public Personnel Management, 18(4), 375-402.

Doyle, D. (1992, March). American education: The challenge, the opportunity. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(7), 512-520.

Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992, June). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(10), 745-752.

Greenwood, F., & Kobu, B. (1990, Winter). Management modification. SAM Advanced Management Journal, 30-33.

Honeycutt, A. (1989, May). The key to effective quality circles. Training and Development Journal, 43(5), 81-84.

Hunnicutt, D. (1987, Spring). Improving education through quality circles. Contemporary Education, 58(3), 138-140.

Jones, F. B., & Villines, R. T. (1987, Winter). Japanese management: What is it and can it be used in education. Planning and Changing, 18(4), 246-251.

Larson, C. E., & LaFasto, F. M. (1989). Teamwork: What must go right/what can go wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Maul, G. P., & Bailey, R. W. (1992, May). A new approach to solving a problem: Training the trainer. Industrial Engineering, pp. 60-62.

Melvin, C. A. III. (1991, Summer). Restructuring schools by applying Deming's management theories. Journal of Staff Development, 12(3), 16-20.

Melvin, C. A. III. (1991, November). Translating Deming's 14 points for education. School Administrator, 48(19), 19-23.

Rhodes, L. A. (1990a, December). Beyond your beliefs: Quantum leaps toward quality schools. School Administrator, 47(11), 23-26.

Rhodes, L. A. (1990b, December). The Deming superintendent. The School Administrator, 47(11), 24-25.

Rhodes, L. A. (1992, March). On the road to quality. Educational Leadership, 49(6), 76-80.

Rocheleau, L. (1991, November). Mt. Eagecumbe's venture in quality: How one superintendent learned the difference between managing and leading. The School Administrator, 48(9), 14-18.

Schargel, F. P. (1991, November/December). Promoting quality in education. Vocational Education Journal, 66(8), 34-35, 77.

Shonk, J. H. (1992). Team-based organizations: Developing a successful team environment. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.

Siu-Runyan, Y., & Heart, S. J. (1992, January). Management manifesto. The Executive Educator, 14(1), 23-26.

Spencer, B. A. (1990, Winter). Reframing techniques for creative strategy development. SAM Advanced Management Journal, 4-8.

Ziegenfuss, J. T. Jr. (1988). Organizational troubleshooters: Resolving problems with customers and employees. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.